



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/868,664

09/26/2001

Stewart Mark Nichols

05222.00161

3001

29638 7590 09/12/2008

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NO. 005222

10 S. WACKER DRIVE, 30TH FLOOR

CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

COUGHLAN, PETER D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2129

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/868,664

**Applicant(s)**

NICHOLS, STEWART MARK

**Examiner**

PETER COUGHLAN

**Art Unit**

2129

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_



### Detailed Action

1. This office action is in response to an AMENDMENT entered January 30, 2008 for the patent application 09/868664 filed on June 20, 2001.
2. All previous office actions are fully incorporated into this Non-Final Office Action by reference.
3. Examiner's Comment: Although, the terms 'carrier wave' or 'carrier signal' is not specifically mentioned within the specification, the Examiner will exclude these interpretations wherein the context of 'memory' is disclosed.

### ***Status of Claims***

4. Claims 1-21 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which

it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. These claims use the term 'capturing portions' which is not clear in response to the specification. Is this outputting the results in response to a user's input? The Examiner does not want to make assumptions on what is meant by 'capturing portions' but feels this is easily remedied by amending the claims to fit language used within the specification.

These claims must be amended or withdrawn from consideration.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) (hereinafter referred to as **Chiang**) being anticipated by Chiang et al., U.S. 5,535,422.

Claim 1

Chiang anticipates matching a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task (**Chiang**, C5:8-35; 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. 'Simulation domain' of applicant is equivalent to 'product' of Chiang. Therefore 'simulation task' of applicant is the current 'product' which is being taught by the tutorial system.); presenting information indicative of a goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Presenting information indicative of a goal' of applicant is equivalent to a 'lesson' of Chiang.); integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; The integration of information of applicant is disclosed by the 'overview of a first lesson' of Chiang.); monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, (**Chiang**, C3:9-19; 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang.), the at least one profile comprises at least one collective characteristic the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45; 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series

of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant.); and displaying details of the computer-implemented method and displaying the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a cognitive educational experience. (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Displaying details' of applicant is accomplished by the 'tutorial window' and the 'product window' of Chiang.)

Claims 2, 11.

Chiang anticipates instantiating a particular feedback model based on characteristics of the student. (**Chiang**, C3:20-44; 'Instantiating a particular feedback' of applicant is illustrated by 'each panel sequentially lists and describes one or more user input actions' of Chiang.)

Claims 3, 12.

Chiang anticipates receiving and analyzing user responses using rule based expert training system to determine details of the computer-implemented method to display. (**Chiang**, C7:17-39; 'Expert system' of applicant is equivalent to 'expert system' of Chiang.)

Claims 5, 14.

Chiang anticipates displaying source code of the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes. (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Displaying source code' of applicant

is the output which is displayed on both the 'tutorial window' and the 'product window' of Chiang.)

Claims 7, 16.

Chiang anticipates capturing portions of the tutorial presentation in response to a user input as the tutorial presentation executes. (**Chiang**, abstract; 'Capturing portions' of applicant is equivalent to 'input system' of Chiang.)

Claim 10

Chiang anticipates a processor that runs a computer program to create the tutorial presentation, the computer program comprising of logic (**Chiang**, abstract; 'Processor' of applicant is equivalent to 'CPU' of Chiang.); a memory that stores information under control of the processor(**Chiang**, abstract; 'Memory' of applicant is equivalent to 'data storage device' of Chiang.) matching a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. 'Simulation domain' of applicant is equivalent to 'product' of Chiang. Therefore 'simulation task' of applicant is the current 'product' which is being taught by the tutorial system. 'Set of criteria' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial window' and 'product window' of Chiang.); presenting information indicative of a goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Presenting information indicative of a goal' of applicant is equivalent to

and

a



'lesson' of Chiang.); integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; The integration of information of applicant is disclosed by the 'overview of a first lesson' of Chiang.); logic monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile (**Chiang**, C3:9-19, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45; 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang.) comprising at least one collective characteristics the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain the at least one profile conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45; The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant. 'Subset of the simulation domain' of applicant is disclosed by the 'linked hierarchically to step panels' of Chiang. 'Conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics' of applicant is disclosed by 'the lesson panels are linked sequentially to other panels' of Chiang.) logic that displays details of the computer-implemented method and that displays the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a

cognitive educational experience. (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Displaying details' of applicant is accomplished by the 'tutorial window' and the 'product window' of Chiang.)

#### Claim 19

Chiang anticipates matching a profile against a simulation domain, wherein the profile comprises a set of criteria and identifies a desired aspect for a current simulation task (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. 'Simulation domain' of applicant is equivalent to 'product' of Chiang. Therefore 'simulation task' of applicant is the current 'product' which is being taught by the tutorial system. 'Set of criteria' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial window' and 'product window' of Chiang.); presenting information indicative of a goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Presenting information indicative of a goal' of applicant is equivalent to a 'lesson' of Chiang.); integrating information that motivates accomplishment of the goal (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; The integration of information of applicant is disclosed by the 'overview of a first lesson' of Chiang.); monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain the at least one profile conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:9-45; 'Monitoring' of

applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang. 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant. 'Subset of the simulation domain' of applicant is disclosed by the 'linked hierarchically to step panels' of Chiang. 'Conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics' of applicant is disclosed by 'the lesson panels are linked sequentially to other panels' of Chiang.); and displaying details of the computer-implemented method and displaying the tutorial presentation as the tutorial presentation executes, wherein the tutorial presentation provides a cognitive educational experience. (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Displaying details' of applicant is accomplished by the 'tutorial window' and the 'product window' of Chiang.)

Claim 20.

Chiang anticipates (d) (i) identifying a subset of the simulation domain from at least one characteristic of the profile; and (**Chiang**, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Plurality of characteristics' of applicant is equivalent to 'steps' of Chiang. 'Each characteristic identifying a subset' of applicant is equivalent to "steps are like subtasks" of Chiang. Therefore 'subset' of applicant is equivalent to 'subtasks' of Chiang. Therefore a single characteristic of applicant is equivalent to 'subtask' of Chiang.) (d)(ii) determining the feedback in accordance with the

subset of the simulation domain. (**Chiang**, C3:9-19; 'Determining the feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of **Chiang**.)

Claim 21

Creating another profile that reuses at least one of the pluralities of characteristics (**Chiang**, C3:66 through C4:10; 'Creating another profile that reuses at least one of the pluralities of characteristics' of applicant is illustrated by the 'lesson control file is structured hierarchically.' If a student wants (creates) another profile that is higher in the hierarchically structure, all of the smaller characteristics would be incorporated into that profile; and providing subsequent feedback to the student, based on the other profile. (**Chiang**, C3:9-19; 'Providing subsequent feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of **Chiang**.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiang as set forth above, in view of Goleh. (U. S. Patent 5372507, referred to as **Goleh**)

Claims 4, 13.

Chiang does not teach browsing details of an object as the tutorial presentation executes.

Goleh teaches browsing details of an object as the tutorial presentation executes. (**Goleh**, C3:24-45; 'Browsing details' of applicant is equivalent to 'menu based system' of Goleh.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Chiang by presenting an outline of the tutorial as taught by Goleh to have browsing details of an object as the tutorial presentation executes.

For the purpose of disclosing to the user an outline of the lesson to aid in understanding the concept of the lesson.

Claims 6, 15.

Chiang does not teach modifying the tutorial presentation based on a user input as the tutorial presentation executes.

Goleh teaches modifying the tutorial presentation based on a user input as the tutorial presentation executes. (**Goleh**, C3:24-45; 'Modifying the tutorial presentation' of

applicant is equivalent to 'As the student progresses through the tutorial, information that is necessary to the student's successful completion of the task at hand may be presented in the appropriate context most conducive to the student's best learning of the immediate subject' of Goleh. By being able to evaluate the task at hand, and providing information at hand indicates the ability to modify the tutorial presentation.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Chiang by disclosing lessons which are indicated as taught by Goleh to have the tutorial presentation based on a user input as the tutorial presentation executes.

For the purpose of limiting the tutorial only to the topic thus having increased efficiency.

Claims 8, 17.

Chiang does not teach tailoring feedback based on a user input Is the tutorial presentation executes.

Goleh teaches tailoring feedback based on a user input Is the tutorial presentation executes. (**Goleh**, C3:24-45, C5:31-54; Goleh discloses the ability to anticipate. Goleh discloses responses to input and evaluation. 'Tailoring feedback' of applicant is disclosed by 'Upon detection, the student is informed of the error through the monitor and appropriate help is given by the tutorial to the student.' Therefore, 'feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'help of Goleh.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings

of Chiang by providing feedback to only what is taught as taught by Goleh to have tailored feedback based on a user input as the tutorial presentation executes.

For the purpose of limiting the feedback only to the topic thus having increased efficiency.

Claims 9, 18.

Chiang does not teach presenting a tailored simulation based on user input as the tutorial presentation executes.

Goleh teaches presenting a tailored simulation based on user input as the tutorial presentation executes. (**Goleh**, C5:15-30; 'Presenting a tailored simulation' of applicant is illustrated by 'possible menu selections may be presented to the student through the monitor to which the student may respond by supplying input through the keyboard to interactively control the operation of the tutorial' of Goleh.) It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Chiang by displaying only what is requested as taught by Goleh to presenting a tailored simulation based on user input as the tutorial presentation executes.

For the purpose of limiting the presentation only to the topic thus having increased efficiency.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on July 14, 2008 for claims 1-21 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

7. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 stand rejected by this Office Action. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-21 for the reasons as will be discussed.

Applicant acknowledges the withdrawal of the objections to the specification and the rejections of claims 2, 11, 3, 12, 4, 13, 5, 14, 6, 15, 8, 9, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

In reference to a telephonic discussion with the Examiner on July 9, 2008, Applicant requests a telephonic interview before the Examiner examines this paper.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Regarding claims 1, 10, and 19, the Office Action alleges that (Page 3, section 4): These claims state the ability that providing feedback will result in motivation to accomplish a goal. There is no documentation that providing feedback to a student which is based on at least one profile will further motivates accomplishment of a goal. The specification lacks any specific information which guarantees 'motivation' based on 'feedback.'

Applicant is amending claim 1 to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics



as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." As amended, claim 1 does not include the alleged ability that "feedback will result in motivation to accomplish a goal." Applicant is similarly amending claim 10 to include the feature of "logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, ~~that further motivates accomplishment of the goal,~~ the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." Also, Applicant is amending claim 19 to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, ~~that further motivates accomplishment of the goal,~~ the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain."

Examiner's response:

The Examiner withdraws the rejection for the independent claims based on the amended claims. Claims 7 and 16 are still rejected due to the specification does not clearly explain what 'capturing portions' means.

8. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claim Rejections -35 U.S.C. §112

Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1, 10, and 19.

Claims 7 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action alleges that (Page 7.):

These claims use the term 'capturing portions' which is not clear in response to the

specification. Is this outputting the results in response to a user's input? The Examiner does not want to make assumptions on what is meant by 'capturing portions' but feels this is easily remedied by amending the claims to fit language used within the specification.

Claim 7 includes the feature of "including capturing portions of the tutorial presentation in response to user input as the tutorial presentation executes." In response to the question posed by the above allegation, the outputting (capturing portions) is in response to user input. For example, the ICAT system looks at the first three journal entries that are entered by the student during the presentation. (Page 15, line 11 - page 16, line 12.): Applicant believes that claim 7 complies with the written requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Also, claim 16 includes the similar feature of "including logic that captures portions of the tutorial presentation in response to user input as the tutorial presentation executes." Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 7 and 16.

Examiner's response:

Claims 7 and 16 are still rejected due to the specification does not clearly explain what 'capturing portions' means. The applicant states above that 'capturing portions' is equivalent to the output of the invention. This does not appear to map to the specification. The specification recites 'several approaches to capture commonalities for reuse', 'framework based reuse is best suited for capturing template like features', 'component based reuse is best suited for capturing block like features', 'the components are based on proven algorithms that capture and implement best practices and provide a conceptual framework and methodology for instructional design' and 'in addition, the utilities let designers capture real item activities of students as they go through the course.' None of these statements which are within the specification does not appear to be equivalent to output. The rejection stands.

9. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,422 (Chiang).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., Page 9, line 32-page 10, line 6.)

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action alleges that (Pages 4-5.):

... monitoring progress toward the goal determining at least one profile that is true, for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, that further motivates accomplishment of the goal (Chiang, C3:9-19; 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang.) the at least one profile conjunctively, using a plurality of characteristics, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain (Chiang, C9:24 through C10:41; 'Plurality of characteristics' of applicant is equivalent to 'steps' of Chiang. 'Each characteristic identifying a subset' of applicant is equivalent to "steps are like subtasks" of Chiang. Therefore a single characteristic of applicant is equivalent to 'subtask' of Chiang ....

However, Chiang fails to even suggest the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." The Office Action alleges that a characteristic is equivalent to step (subtask) as discussed in Chiang, where each lesson panel 118 includes a numbered list of steps 124 and where each step defines a subtask. (Column 10, lines 50-52.) Chiang further discloses step panel 142 having "Next Step" and "Previous Step" pointers so that the user can sequential navigate through the ordered sequence of steps. (Column 11, lines 15-17.) Chiang merely discloses a sequential execution of steps for an associated lesson, where only one step is active at a particular time. However, Chiang fails to even suggest

a "collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands."

Examiner's response:

The applicant states that 'Chiang fails to even suggest the feature of monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain.' The Examiner disagrees. 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang. (**Chiang**, C3:9-19) 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant. (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45)

10. In reference to the Applicant's argument:

Independent claim 10 includes the similar feature of "logic that monitors progress toward the goal, determines at least one profile that is true for the current simulation task from a set of profiles, and provides feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain."

Also, independent claim 19 includes the feature of "monitoring progress toward the goal, determining at least one profile from that is true for the current simulation task a set of profiles, and providing feedback to a student, based on the at least one profile, the at least one profile comprising at least one collective characteristic, the at least one collective characteristic being a conditional using a plurality of characteristics as operands, each characteristic identifying a subset of the simulation domain." Moreover, claims 2-3, 5, 7, 11-12, 14, 16, and 20-21 ultimately depend from claims 1, 10, and 19. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 10-12, 14, 16, and 19-21.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chiang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,372,507 (Goleh).

Claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 ultimately depend from independent claims 1 and 10. Moreover, the deficiencies of Chiang are not remedied by Goleh, and thus claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, and 18.

All objections and rejections have been addressed. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Examiner's response:

Likewise, in independent claims the Examiner discloses the recites elements are within the cited reference. Claim 10 and 19 roughly have the same claimed material which the Examiner explains 'Profile' of applicant is equivalent to 'tutorial system' of Chiang. 'Monitoring' of applicant is equivalent to 'monitor' of Chiang. 'Providing feedback' of applicant is equivalent to 'provide input assistance' of Chiang. (**Chiang**, C3:9-19, C5:8-

35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45) The 'tutorial system' is composed of tutorial information. The tutorial information is presented by a series of lesson panels. Each lesson panel can be seen as a characteristic. Then the series of lesson panels can be seen as the 'collective characteristic' of applicant. 'Subset of the simulation domain' of applicant is disclosed by the 'linked hierarchically to step panels' of Chiang. 'Conjunctively using a plurality of characteristics' of applicant is disclosed by 'the lesson panels are linked sequentially to other panels' of Chiang. (**Chiang**, C5:8-35, C7:17-39, C9:24 through C10:41, C3:21-45)

### ***Examination Considerations***

11. The claims and only the claims form the metes and bounds of the invention. "Office personnel are to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d, 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969)" (MPEP p 2100-8, c 2, I 45-48; p 2100-9, c 1, I 1-4). The Examiner has the full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense. Examiner will reference prior art using terminology familiar to one of ordinary skill in the art. Such an approach is broad in concept and can be either explicit or implicit in meaning.

12. Examiner's Notes are provided to assist the applicant to better understand the nature of the prior art, application of such prior art and, as appropriate, to further indicate other prior art that maybe applied in other office actions. Such comments are entirely consistent with the intent and sprit of compact prosecution. However, and unless otherwise stated, the Examiner's Notes are not prior art but link to prior art that one of ordinary skill in the art would find inherently appropriate.

13. Examiner's Opinion: Paragraphs 11 and 12 apply. The Examiner has full latitude to interpret each claim in the broadest reasonable sense.

### ***Conclusion***

14. The prior art of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

-U. S. Patent 5566291: Boulton

-U. S. Patent 5493658: Chiang

-U. S. Patent 5820386: Sheppard

15. Claims 1-21 are rejected.

***Correspondence Information***

16. Any inquiry concerning this information or related to the subject disclosure should be directed to the Examiner Peter Coughlan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5990. The Examiner can be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:15 a.m. to 3:45 p.m.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor David Vincent can be reached at (571) 272-3080. Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks,  
Washington, D. C. 20231;

Hand delivered to:

Receptionist,  
Customer Service Window,  
Randolph Building,  
401 Dulany Street,



Alexandria, Virginia 22313,

(located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building);

or faxed to:

(571) 272-3150 (for formal communications intended for entry.)

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

/P. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2129

Peter Coughlan

9/9/2008

/David R Vincent/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2129